

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box →

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

AF
JFW

TRANSMITTAL FORM <small>MAY 01 2006</small> <small>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</small>		Application Number 09/902,536
		Filing Date July 11, 2001
		First Named Inventor ALBERTSSON <i>et al.</i>
		Group Art Unit 3682
		Examiner Name C. Hansen
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	20	Attorney Docket Number

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers <i>(for an Application)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group <i>(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) <i>(please identify below):</i> Appellant's Brief Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 - IN TRIPPLICATE
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		Remarks
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm or Individual name	Venable P.O. Box 34385 Washington, D.C. 20043-9998	*26694* 26694 <small>PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE</small>
Signature	Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134 	
Date	May 1, 2006	

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450b <input type="text"/> on this date: <input type="text"/>		
Typed or printed name		
Signature		

VENABLE
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, 22313-1450.



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Effective on 12/08/2004.

Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).

FEE TRANSMITTAL

For FY 2006

 Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT **(\$)** **0**
Complete if Known

Application Number	09/902,536
Filing Date	July 11, 2001
First Named Inventor	ALBERTSSON et al.
Examiner Name	C.M. Hansen
Art Unit	3682
Attorney Docket No.	43315-214365

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

Check Credit Card Money Order None Other (please identify): _____
 Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 22-0261 Deposit Account Name: Venable LLP

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

Charge fee(s) indicated below Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee
 Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 Credit any overpayments

FEE CALCULATION (All the fees below are due upon filing or may be subject to a surcharge.)**1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES**

Application Type	FILING FEES		SEARCH FEES		EXAMINATION FEES		Fees Paid (\$)
	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	
Utility	300	150	500	250	200	100	
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65	
Plant	200	100	300	150	160	80	
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300	
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0	

2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES**Fee Description**

Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)

Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)
----------	-----------------------

50 25

Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)

200 100

Multiple dependent claims

360 180

Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
--------------	--------------	----------	---------------

- 20 or HP x = _____

Multiple Dependent Claims

Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
----------	---------------

HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20.

Indep. Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
---------------	--------------	----------	---------------

- 3 or HP x = _____

HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 3.

3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE

If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).

Total Sheets	Extra Sheets	Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
--------------	--------------	--	----------	---------------


- 100 = /50 (round up to a whole number) x = _____

Fees Paid (\$)**4. OTHER FEE(S)**

Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount)

Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): .00

SUBMITTED BY

Signature		Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	37,134	Telephone	(202) 344-4000
Name (Print/Type)	Eric J. Franklin			Date	May 1, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.136. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 30 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete the form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:)
T. ALBERTSSON et al.) Attorney Docket: 43315-214365
Application No.: 09/902,536) Group Art Unit: 3682
Filed: July 11, 2001) Examiner: C. M. HANSEN

For: MANIPULATOR

APPELLANT'S BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This brief is being resubmitted pursuant to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated March 29, 2006.

This brief was originally filed furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed in connection with this application on March 9, 2004, and appealing the final rejection of claims 2-6 and 11 mailed December 17, 2003. This brief is transmitted in triplicate.

1. The Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest in this appeal is the assignee, ABB AB, SE-721 83 Västerås, Sweden.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellant is not aware of any other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

3. Status of Claims in Application

The status of the claims is as follows:

Claims canceled: 1 and 7-10

Claims pending: 2-6 and 11

Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None

Claims allowed: None

Claims rejected: 2-6 and 11

The claims on appeal are 2-6 and 11.

4. Status of Amendments

Applicant submits concurrently herewith an amendment to the specification and claim 2 that were included in the Brief as originally submitted. The amendment to the specification corrects a typographical error in the English translation filed July 11, 2001, of Swedish priority application 0002654-2. The amendment to claim 2 corrects a typographical error and helps to ensure that elements are commonly referred to in the claims.

Since the issuance of the December 17, 2003 Final Office Action, which was issued in response to an Amendment filed September 24, 2003, no other Amendments have been filed. The December 17, 2003 Final Office Action is the second Final Office Action on the merits in this case which includes a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on May 30, 2003.

5. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Appellant's invention relates to an industrial robot including an anthropomorphic manipulator having a supporting device for holding cabling between two mutually movable arm parts so as to absorb any slack in the cabling by a predetermined and coordinated movement of the arm parts, (Page 1:5-13).

As discussed in the original specification, the present invention purports to solve a special problem existing in anthropomorphic robots, where the upper axis rotates about its own longitudinal axis, (Page 2:9-10). In such robots, the cabling must be capable of being wound up around the upper arm without conflicting with objects in the working range of the robot, (Page 2:10-15). Therefore, one key object of the present invention is to provide a device for holding and stretching the cabling such that loosely hanging loops are avoided. Compared to conventional robots, for anthropomorphic robots, the capability of holding and stretching the cabling is needed because the required length of the cable bundle is increased due to the upper arm including a front arm part arranged for rotation about its longitudinal axis, such that the rotation would be significantly limited if the cabling were of a reduced length as in conventional robots.

Referring to Figs. 1 and 2 reproduced below, Appellant's invention includes an anthropomorphic manipulator having upper arm 1 including rear arm part 2 and front arm part 3 arranged for rotation about its longitudinal axis, (Page 6:27-30). Rear arm part 2 is supported by lower arm 4, and front arm part 3 is journalled in rear arm part 2 and is rotatable around first axis A, (Page 6:30-33). Front arm part 3 supports fork-shaped wrist 5 having journalled therein hand 6 further including a journalled turning disc 7 for supporting a tool (not shown), (Page 6:33 – Page 7:1). As shown in Fig. 1, turning disc 7 is rotatable around second axis B.




Fig. 1 of 09/902,536




Fig. 2 of 09/902,536

As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the anthropomorphic manipulator according to the present invention includes supporting device 8 including supporting arm 9 and auxiliary arm 10, with supporting arm 9 being journaled in a stand 11 which is fixed to rear arm part 2 and which is rotatable around a third axis C arranged across first axis A, (Page 7:4-9). Supporting arm 9 further includes in its outer end first attachment 13, which has been illustrated as snap-in closure 14 for mounting and dismounting one end of cabling 12, (Page 7:9-11). Likewise, auxiliary arm 10 includes second attachment 15 with snap-in closure 16 for mounting and dismounting the other end of cabling 12, (Page 7:12-13). As shown in Fig. 2, supporting arm 9 further includes a right-angled part at the top end thereof for supporting cabling 12 centrally over upper arm 1, (Page 7:15-17).

Referring specifically to Fig. 1, as hand 6 is rotated, the position of the auxiliary arm 10 adopted during such a movement is shown by the designation 10', the supporting arm by 9' and the cabling by 12', (Page 7:18-22). During this rotation of hand 6, supporting arm 9 exerts a spring force on cabling 12' by means of spiral spring 17 arranged around third axis C, (Page 7:24-26). Spring 17 is configured such that in an initial position of supporting arm 9, the spring force is directed backwards along cabling 12 (i.e. to the right in Fig. 1), and when supporting arm 9 is bent out (i.e. 9'), the spring force rotates in relation to the longitudinal direction of the cabling, (Page 7:30-34). Accordingly, in addition to providing a pulling force, supporting arm 9 also tends to lift the cabling, which is favourable when the cabling is wound up around rotatable

front arm part 3, (Page 7:34 – Page 8:1). In order to prevent supporting arm 9 from exerting an uneven load on the cabling, the attachment of either supporting arm 9 or auxiliary arm 10, or both, may be arranged with an articulated attachment to the respective arm, (Page 8:1-5).

Accordingly, a key aspect of the present invention is to guide and hold the cabling stretched in the front area of the manipulator, such that the loop, which must be kept at disposal for the movement of the front robot arms, is arranged behind upper robot arm 1. The present invention thus achieves the aforementioned exemplary aspect by providing an anthropomorphic manipulator having upper arm 1 for winding cable 12 around the upper arm without conflicting with objects in the working range of the robot, by holding and stretching the cabling such that loosely hanging loops are avoided.

6. Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal

The claims on appeal (2-6 and 11) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over the following prior art:

U.S. Patent No. 4,529,352 (*Suzuki*);
U.S. Patent No. 5,606,235 (*Mauletti*); and
U.S. Patent No. 5,593,265 to (*Kizer*).

The issue presented for review is whether the rejection of claims 2-6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over *Suzuki*, *Mauletti* and *Kizer* should be reversed due to the lack of disclosure and the lack of teaching or suggestion of the features recited in each of the claims.

7. Argument

The rejection of independent claim 11, and claims 2-6, which depend therefrom, is improper and should be reversed.

In the final rejection dated December 17, 2003, claims 2-6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Suzuki*, *Mauletti* and *Kizer*. Appellant traverses

the rejection of claims 2-6 and 11 for the following reasons.

With regard to independent claim 11, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Suzuki, Mauletti* and *Kizer*, whether viewed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest an anthropomorphic manipulator, including, "an upper arm which comprises a rear arm part and which further comprises a front arm part having a longitudinal axis, the front arm part being arranged for rotation about said longitudinal axis, cabling extending along the said arm parts and being arranged as to be wound around said front arm part when said front arm part is rotated about said longitudinal axis, the front arm part being journalled in bearings in the rear arm part for relative rotation, a supporting device for guiding and holding the cabling in a stretched condition at the front arm part, the supporting device comprising a supporting arm rotatably arranged on the rear arm part and an auxiliary arm arranged at the front arm part," as recited in independent claim 11.

As discussed above and as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2 reproduced on the next page, the present invention provides an anthropomorphic manipulator, including an upper arm 1 having a rear arm part 2 and a front arm part 3 having a longitudinal axis A, with front arm part 3 being arranged for rotation about the longitudinal axis. Cabling 12 may extend along the arm parts and be arranged as to be wound around front arm part 3 when the front arm part is rotated about longitudinal axis A. Front arm part 3 may be journalled in bearings in rear arm part 2 for relative rotation. A supporting device 8 may be provided for guiding and holding cabling 12 in a stretched condition at front arm part 3, with the supporting device including a supporting arm 9 rotatably arranged on rear arm part 2 and an auxiliary arm 10 arranged at front arm part 3.




Fig. 1 of 09/902,536




Fig. 2 of 09/902,536

The aforementioned arrangement, as recited in independent claim 11, is clearly distinguished over the teachings of *Suzuki*, *Mauletti* and *Kizer*, and further presents several distinct and unobvious advantages over the conventional cable support arrangements of *Suzuki*, *Mauletti* and *Kizer*, in a manner in which *Suzuki*, *Mauletti* and *Kizer* fail to recognize much less solve the problems addressed by the present invention.

For example, *Suzuki*, as illustrated in Fig. 2 reproduced at right and Fig. 3 reproduced on the next page, discloses a cable support of a robot which includes a movable support 3a mounted on operating arm 13 at the wrist-side end thereof and an auxiliary support at 41 mounted on operating arm 13 at the opposite end thereof to support cable 5 in a manner such that the supports can freely be rotated and tilted to readily follow the movement of the cable (Col. 1:40-46). Operating arm 13 tilts in an upward direction and downward direction (Col. 1:61-62). According to the *Suzuki* invention, the cable support described above enables cable 5 to readily and smoothly follow the rotation of movable support 3a, and the rotation and tilting of cable clamp 43 (on rotary shaft 41) and cable holder 33 (col. 3, lines 22 to 25).




Fig. 2 of Suzuki




Fig. 3 of Suzuki

In accordance with the present invention, as discussed above, a supporting device 8 is provided for holding a part of cabling 12, which part extends between two mutually movable arm parts 9, 10 of the anthropomorphic manipulator, such that a slack of the cabling is absorbed (see Specification, page 1:8-11). As also set forth in the original specification, a special problem exists in anthropomorphic robots, where the upper axis rotates about its own longitudinal axis, (Page 2:9-12). In such robots, the cabling must be capable of being wound up around the upper arm. Thus, a surplus of the cabling must be arranged such that it can be wound around front arm part 3 of upper arm 1 when front arm part 3 rotates about its longitudinal axis A. A key object of the present invention is therefore to provide a device for holding and stretching the cabling such that loosely hanging loops are avoided, and stretching the cabling such that it does not conflict with objects in the working range of the robot.

In distinct contrast to the anthropomorphic manipulator disclosed for the present invention and recited in independent claim 11, the conventional industrial robot disclosed by *Suzuki* is not an anthropomorphic robot where the upper arm rotates about its own longitudinal

axis as in the present invention. Instead, for the robot of *Suzuki*, second tilt arm 13 tilts upwardly and downwardly about an axis forming a hinged connection with first tilt arm 12 which tilts in a forward and backward direction. Thus the *Suzuki* robot operates in a completely different manner than the anthropomorphic manipulator disclosed for the present invention, and hence *Suzuki* fails to recognize much less solve the problems addressed by the present invention.

For example, cable 5 for *Suzuki* is not arranged such that it can be wound around the upper arm when this arm is rotated as is the case with the present invention. In other words, *Suzuki* does not teach or suggest, “cabling extending along the said arm parts and being arranged as to be wound around said front arm part when said front arm part is rotated about said longitudinal axis,” as recited in independent claim 11. Instead, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of *Suzuki*, reproduced at right, cable 5 of *Suzuki* is supported in the shape of a crown making the cable supporting portion of the movable support 3a as a peak and providing slacks on the cable portions 5a and 5b which dispose at both sides of the peak, as shown in dotted outline in Fig. 3 of *Suzuki*. Thus, *Suzuki* also does not teach or suggest, “a supporting device for guiding and holding the cabling in a stretched condition at the front arm part, the supporting device comprising a supporting arm rotatably arranged on the rear arm part and an auxiliary arm arranged at the front arm part,” as recited in independent claim 11. This clearly contrasts with the arrangement according to the present invention in which the supporting device is provided for guiding and holding the cable in a stretched condition (not slacked as in *Suzuki*) at front arm part 3 of upper arm 1. The supporting device according to the present invention thus holds and stretches the cable such that loosely hanging loops are avoided and such that the cable does not conflict with objects in the working range of the robot. The cable support device of *Suzuki*, on the other hand, is not capable of functioning in such a manner, such that the cable is firmly supported.




Fig. 2 of *Suzuki*




Fig. 3 of *Suzuki*

Moreover, Appellant respectfully asserts that the *Suzuki* disclosure provides no suggestion or motivation for applying the cable support disclosed therein to an anthropomorphic manipulator in which the cabling extends along front and rear arm parts of the upper arm of the manipulator and is arranged as to be wound around the front arm part when that front arm part is rotated about its longitudinal axis, as in the manner and for the purpose of the present invention.

In realizing the aforementioned deficiencies in the teachings of *Suzuki*, the December 17, 2003 Office Action cites *Mauletti* (for the first time) for disclosing an anthropomorphic manipulator and thereby concludes that “[i]t would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the immediate rotating portion of *Mauletti* (US Pat. 5,606,235) arm within *Suzuki et al* (US Pat. 4,529,35[2]) so as to allow for increased position and degrees of freedom for the end effector of *Suzuki et al* (US Pat. 4,529,35[2]).”

Appellant respectfully disagrees with this unfounded conclusion for several reasons. Specifically, *Mauletti*, as illustrated in Fig. 1 reproduced below, discloses a robot having a plurality of elements amongst which one of the elements includes an anthropomorphic manipulator at 12 having a front arm part arranged for rotation about its longitudinal axis. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully agrees with the Examiner in that *Mauletti* indeed discloses a robot having a plurality of elements including an anthropomorphic manipulator. However, Appellant is readily aware of the existence of anthropomorphic manipulators having a front arm part arranged for rotation about its longitudinal axis and the mere fact that *Mauletti* discloses an anthropomorphic manipulator does not validate the conclusion that the teachings of *Mauletti* and *Suzuki* render the invention recited in claim 11 of the present invention obvious.




Fig. 1 of *Mauletti*

As such, Appellant respectfully asserts that the combination of *Suzuki* and *Mauletti* as suggested in the Office Action would be unwarranted, impractical, and would nevertheless not come up with what Appellant has achieved herein.

Appellant thus respectfully further asserts that the Examiner has failed to meet the burden set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2142 for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness in concluding that the combined teachings of *Suzuki* and *Mauletti*, teach or suggest each feature of claims 2-6 and 11. Specifically, Examiner has failed to meet the following three basic required criteria:

- * First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Appellant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has provided no motivation whatsoever for combining the teachings of 2-6 and 11, but has merely concluded that since *Mauletti* discloses an anthropomorphic manipulator, that “[i]t would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the immediate rotating portion of *Mauletti* (US Pat. 5,606,235) arm within *Suzuki* et al (US Pat. 4,529,35[2]) so as to allow for increased position and degrees of freedom for the end effector of *Suzuki* et al (US Pat. 4,529,35[2]).” Appellant respectfully agrees with the Examiner that it would indeed be beneficial to have an anthropomorphic manipulator having a front arm part arranged for rotation about its longitudinal axis with increased position and degrees of freedom. However, Appellant is unclear as to how the support arms and cable grasping components of *Suzuki* could be used with the robot of *Mauletti*, as suggested by the Examiner, as the two robots operate on entirely different principles. Moreover, Appellant respectfully asserts that even if the teachings of *Suzuki* were applied to the robotic device of *Mauletti*, one of ordinary skill in the art would still fail to achieve Appellant’s invention in that cable 5 for *Suzuki* is not arranged such that it can be wound around the upper arm when this arm is rotated as is the case with the present invention (see also recitation in independent claim 11 of present invention). Instead, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of *Suzuki*, reproduced above, cable 5 of *Suzuki* is supported in the shape of a crown making the cable supporting portion of the movable support 3a as a peak and providing slacks on the cable portions 5a and 5b which dispose at both sides of the peak, as shown in dotted outline in Fig. 3 of *Suzuki* (see also recitation in independent claim 11 of present invention). This clearly contrasts with the arrangement according to the present invention in which the supporting device is provided for guiding and holding the cable in a stretched condition (not slacked as in *Suzuki*) at front arm part 3 of upper arm 1. The supporting device according to the present

invention thus holds and stretches the cable such that loosely hanging loops are avoided and such that the cable does not conflict with objects in the working range of the robot. The cable support device of *Suzuki*, on the other hand, is not capable of functioning in such a manner, such that the cable is firmly supported. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art could not apply the teachings of *Suzuki* to the robotic device of *Mauletti* as the two devices function in entirely different manners and therefore present a variety of unique and different problems associated with their specific operation.

- * Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. As discussed above, even if the teachings of *Suzuki* were applied to the robotic device of *Mauletti*, one of ordinary skill in the art would still fail to achieve Appellant's invention and the combination would still fail to teach or suggest the anthropomorphic manipulator having a front arm part arranged for rotation about its longitudinal axis, as recited in independent claim 11 of the present invention. Moreover, as also discussed above, one of ordinary skill in the art would not arbitrarily apply the teachings of *Suzuki* to the robotic device of *Mauletti* as the two devices function in entirely different manners and therefore present a variety of unique problems associated with their specific operation (i.e. *Suzuki* teaches a slackened cable, whereas *Mauletti* would require a stretched cable, as disclosed for the present invention and recited in independent claim 11).
- * Finally, the prior art reference, and not the Appellant's disclosure must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Based upon the discussion above, Appellant respectfully asserts that the mere combination of two entirely different teachings of *Suzuki* and *Mauletti*, in itself, without the requisite motivation or expectation of success, clearly proves that it is Appellant's disclosure that teaches the claim limitations and not the teachings of the prior art references.

Lastly, Appellant respectfully notes that *Kizer*, which has been cited as disclosing a spiral spring (recited in dependent claim 5) also fails to overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of

Suzuki and Mauletti.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 points out that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Since this criterion has not been met, Appellant respectfully submits that *Suzuki*, *Mauletti* and *Kizer*, whether taken alone or in combination, clearly neither teach nor suggest the novel combinations of features recited in independent claim 11, and hence dependent claims 2-6. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claim 11 should be reversed.

9. **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests the reversal of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 22-0261. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,



Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936

Date: 5/1/06

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (Canceled)
2. (Previously Amended) A manipulator according to claim 11, wherein the supporting arm comprises an angled part which permits the cabling to be held stretched centrally over the front arm.
3. (Previously Amended) A manipulator according to claim 11, wherein the auxiliary arm is arranged at a turning disc of the manipulator.
4. (Previously Amended) A manipulator according to claim 11, wherein the supporting arm and the auxiliary arm support a bendable tube for reception of the cabling.
5. (Previously Amended) A manipulator according to claim 11, wherein the supporting arm has a spiral spring for exerting a spring force on the cabling.
6. (Previously Amended) A manipulator according to claim 5, wherein the spiral spring is housed in a container.
7. (Canceled)
8. (Canceled)
9. (Canceled)
10. (Canceled)
11. (Previously Added) An anthropomorphic manipulator, comprising an upper arm which comprises a rear arm part and which further comprises a front arm part having a longitudinal axis, the front arm part being arranged for rotation about said longitudinal axis,

cabling extending along the said arm parts and being arranged as to be wound around said front arm part when said front arm part is rotated about said longitudinal axis, the front arm part being journalled in bearings in the rear arm part for relative rotation, a supporting device for guiding and holding the cabling in a stretched condition at the front arm part, the supporting device comprising a supporting arm rotatably arranged on the rear arm part and an auxiliary arm arranged at the front arm part.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None